

CHAPTER 16 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Pursuant to CEQA Section 15126.6, an EIR shall describe “a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” The evaluation of alternatives shall explain why the proposed project was selected over other development scenarios, including the “no project” alternative and alternatives that would eliminate or reduce significant adverse environmental impacts. Less detailed discussion may occur where an alternative causes one or more significant impacts in addition to those described for the proposed project. In addition, this section will identify the “environmentally superior alternative” (CEQA).

The range of alternatives is limited by the “rule of reason,” and the EIR should discuss the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be evaluated. The “rule of reason” is described in Section 15126.6(f):

Rule of reason. The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason” that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. Of those alternatives, the EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project. The range of feasible alternatives shall be selected and discussed in a manner to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision-making.

In accordance with these guidelines, this discussion will not include consideration of alternatives determined to be remote or speculative, that would not avoid or lessen significant impacts, or that could not attain the basic objectives of the proposed project.

16.1 SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVES FOR DEWITT GOVERNMENT CENTER FACILITY PLAN

As required in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, project alternatives selected for analysis are those alternatives capable of eliminating or reducing to a level of insignificance, one or more of the significant adverse environmental effects of the project as proposed. Alternatives were selected based on feasibility and ability to meet basic project objectives, but potential alternatives were not rejected based on their likelihood to slightly impede the attainment of the project objectives or their likelihood to be more costly than the proposed project.

Objectives of the Proposed Project

The proposed project would establish a plan for construction, demolition, and relocation of employees across DeWitt Center throughout the plan period of 2003 through 2010. The plan would be enacted through completion of ten distinct phases of activities. Development of the proposed project was based on direction provided to the Placer County Department of Facility Services from previous planning and facility needs assessment documents as well as from the Placer County Board of Supervisors, who have indicated that the County should pursue consolidation of government services within DeWitt Center. In addition to this specific

direction from the Board of Supervisors, the following objectives have been identified for the proposed project:

1. Consolidate County Services in DeWitt Government Center to ensure effective and efficient delivery of government services to the citizens of the County.
2. Remove aged, outdated and potentially hazardous building inventory.
3. Improve working conditions for County staff and the public accessing government services.
4. Consolidate land development departments to facilitate improved customer service and interdepartmental communication.
5. Consolidate public safety services (Sheriff, Dispatch, 911, and District Attorney and Probation) in a secure and structurally sound essential facility in close proximity to the existing detention facilities.
6. Improve the conditions and capacity of the children and women's health centers and provide a more residential atmosphere for these facilities while keeping the centers in close proximity to other government and social services.

Alternatives included in this analysis were selected partly based on their ability to meet the basic intent of these objectives.

Impacts of the Proposed Project

The proposed project was found to have significant environmental impacts before implementation of mitigation measures in the following areas:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| ■ Aesthetics, | ■ Geology and Soils |
| ■ Transportation and Circulation, | ■ Hydrology and Water Quality, |
| ■ Air Quality, | ■ Cultural Resources, and |
| ■ Noise, | ■ Hazards and Hazardous Materials. |
| ■ Biological Resources, | |

Impacts in all resource areas except Air Quality and Cultural Resources were found to be less than significant after implementation of mitigation measures included in the EIR. The remaining Significant and Unavoidable impacts were:

Impact 7.1 – Violation of an Air Quality Standard or Substantial Contribution to an Existing Air Quality Violation Due to Construction Activities,

Impact 7.2 – Exposure of Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations During Construction Phases, and

Impact 12.2 – Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of a Historical Resource.

Both Air Quality impacts were Significant and Unavoidable only with respect to the pollutant nitrogen oxide (NO_x), and were less than significant with respect to other pollutants following implementation of mitigation measures to address all demolition, site preparation, and construction generated pollutant emissions. Mitigation measures were included in the EIR to lessen the significance of the Cultural Resources impact, however, under CEQA case law, no mitigation is available that would reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

The alternatives included in this analysis were selected based in part on their ability to reduce any impacts of the proposed project. Specifically, these considerations evaluated the following scenarios:

1. For impacts considered Significant prior to implementation of mitigation measures – the ability of the alternative to reduce an impact to a less than significant level, thereby eliminating the need for some mitigation measures;
2. For impacts considered Less than Significant after implementation of mitigation measures – the ability of the alternative to further reduce the extent of an impact after implementation of the same mitigation measures applied to the proposed project; and
3. For impacts considered Significant and Unavoidable after implementation of mitigation measures – the ability of the alternative to reduce an impact to a less than significant level either with or without implementation of the mitigation measures applied to the proposed project.

16.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

Several potential alternatives to individual phases of the proposed DeWitt Government Center Facility Plan were considered during preparation of this analysis, including both onsite and offsite alternative locations. Of the potential alternatives, three were rejected from further consideration based on preliminary review of the feasibility of the alternative and its ability to meet the project objectives.

Onsite Alternatives Rejected

Alternative locations for the proposed Land Development Building (LDB) and Auburn Justice Center (AJC) were considered as a possible means of reducing the demolition of representative samples of historic architecture and of eliminating new construction within and adjacent to the identified historic district that comprises the eastern portion of DeWitt Center. The existing level of development throughout the project area limits the onsite alternative locations for either the LDB or the AJC to sites between the onsite open water ponds and the existing Juvenile Hall and Main Jail. This area was rejected from further consideration as alternative onsite locations because development here would have significant impacts on the biological resources of the open water ponds and the oak woodland. With respect to the LDB facility, this location would physically separate the land development government services from other government services located in the developed portion of DeWitt Center, thus this alternative would not meet the intent of Project Objectives 1 and 3. With respect to the AJC, this location would disconnect the AJC from the Juvenile Hall and Main Jail, which would diminish the attainment of the intent of Project Objective 5.

Shifting the locations of the LDB or AJC to the location of Buildings 212A&B through 217A&B was also rejected as an onsite alternative due to the infeasibility of demolishing those buildings prior to constructing the new facilities that would accommodate the transfers of employees and tenants currently housed in the buildings proposed for demolition. Additionally, no substantial reduction in impacts to any resource area would be realized through implementation of this onsite alternative.

Offsite Alternatives Rejected

A review of recent aerial photography and zoning and land use designations for lands surrounding DeWitt Center was conducted to evaluate the potential for locating any of the proposed project components offsite. In order to meet the intent of Project Objective 1 and the specific direction from the Board of Supervisors, only nearby properties with convenient access to DeWitt Center were considered feasible. Therefore, vacant parcels in outlying areas, such as the vacant land north of the new Target store at SR 49 and Bell Road, were rejected from further consideration as alternative offsite locations for project components.

Vacant land exists north of DeWitt Center at the northern terminus of Richardson Drive. As shown on *Figures 2-3 and 2-4* in **CHAPTER 2, PROJECT DESCRIPTION**, this property is zoned RM-Dc (multiple family, design scenic corridor) and RM-DL15 (multiple family, with a maximum density of 15 units per acre) and the community plan designations are MU and LDR (mixed use and low density residential). The undeveloped land that carries the MU designation is a strip of land approximately 175 feet wide and 2,200 feet long. This configuration of land would not accommodate the proposed office land uses. The LDR designated land extends to the west of the MU land, providing a larger building space. However, the proposed LDB and AJC office uses are not consistent with the residential designations. Based on the infeasibility of development of office land uses on the MU portion of this parcel and the inconsistency of development of office land uses on the LDR portion, this site was rejected from further consideration as an offsite alternative for the LDB and AJC. Additionally, the distance between this site and other government and justice services at DeWitt Center do not meet the intent of Project Objectives 1, 3, and 5.

16.3 ALTERNATIVES SELECTED FOR ANALYSIS

As the proposed project is separated into distinct phases, the alternatives analyzed provide an alternative for individual phases as feasible. There is a no-project alternative for each construction or demolition phase (Alternatives 1, 2, 4, and 7), which, when combined, provide the no-project alternative scenario for the overall facility plan. Alternatives are not considered for Phases E, G, and I, which involve only transfers of employees and are dependant on the other phases of the proposed project. These phases are not anticipated to result in any environmental impacts.

Seven project alternatives were selected for discussion and comparison with the proposed project. They are summarized as follows:

Alternative 1: Land Development Building No Project Alternative

The No Project alternative for the Land Development Building (LDB) assumes that the LDB will not be constructed as proposed. Therefore, no demolition, grading, or construction would be necessary at the LDB site. As a consequence of not building the LDB, all County departments governing land development would remain in their existing buildings (Buildings 102 through 108), and these buildings would not be available for occupation by tenants of Buildings 15 through 18. This would also constrain the ability of these departments to increase staffing. This alternative assumes that construction of the Auburn Justice Center (AJC) will occur, and as the housing relocation plan for the inhabitants of Buildings 2 and 3 has already been approved, the existing tenants of Buildings 15 through 18 are assumed to be transferred to the existing

buildings on the LDB site (Buildings 1 through 8) and the AJC. Alternative 1 would not meet the intent of Project Objective 3 but would not interfere with attainment of any other objectives.

Alternative 2: Auburn Justice Center No Project Alternative

The No Project alternative for the AJC assumes that construction of the AJC will not occur and that the AJC site will remain in its current condition. The site is vacant but has been graded previously. Therefore, no new grading or construction would occur at this site. As a consequence of not building the AJC, no employee transfers to this facility would occur. This alternative assumes that construction of the LDB would proceed as proposed, requiring that existing employees within Buildings 1, 6, 7, and 8 would need to be transferred out of the LDB site. This alternative assumes that all employees of County justice and law enforcement departments housed at DeWitt Center would be transferred to some of the buildings currently occupied by the land development departments. This will limit the space availability for other transfers from the buildings proposed for demolition, and may preclude some of the proposed demolition. Therefore, this alternative would not meet the intent of Project Objective 5 and could interfere with attainment of Project Objective 2.

Alternative 3: 14-Acre Site, Land Development Building and/or Auburn Justice Center

The vacant parcel between the DeWitt Center Study Area and State Route 49 (SR 49) is designated for Mixed Use development by the *Auburn/Bowman Community Plan* and designated Commercial Planned Development (CPD) and Design Scenic Corridor (-Dc) in the *Placer County Zoning Ordinance*. This site is within Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone D, as are the LDB and AJC proposed sites. This site, indicated on *Figure 16-1*, is owned by the County, and has been determined to be a viable alternative site for either the LDB or the AJC. As the EIR study area does not include this parcel, this is considered to be an offsite alternative.

This alternative offsite location is bound by First Street to the southwest and Professional Drive to the northwest. Although not a part of the proposed project, County planning documents call for the extension of Willow Creek Road from SR 49, through this site, to connect to First Street at F Avenue. SR 49 runs in a north-south direction approximately 1,000 feet to the east, and Bell Road runs in an east-west direction approximately 800 feet north of the alternative site.

Alternative 4: Children's Emergency Shelter and Women's Center No Project Alternative

The No Project alternative for the Children's Emergency Shelter and Women's Center (CES and WC) projects assumes that construction of the anticipated CES and WC facilities will not occur and that these services will continue to occupy existing buildings. This alternative assumes that development of the LDB and AJC and proposed building and facility demolition will occur as proposed, with the exception of the buildings currently housing the existing CES and WC facilities. As the existing CES and WC facilities are proposed to be relocated to the new facilities, they are not accommodated in the proposed relocation plan. Thus, if new buildings are not constructed for these facilities, the buildings in which they are currently housed will not be demolished.

Figure 16-1

Alternative 5: Children's Emergency Shelter and Women's Center Pasture Site

The Pasture Site is an onsite alternative location for the CES and WC facilities. The Pasture Site is located north of the proposed CES and WC site, as shown in *Figure 16-1*. Alternative 5 would locate all proposed CES and WC facilities on the Pasture Site, with access provided via an extension of B Avenue. This roadway would cross the riparian wetland north of the open water pond onsite. Other infrastructure (i.e., sewer and water lines) would be extended in the same alignment as B Avenue. This would preclude the use of a bridge to span the wetland. Biological impacts associated with this alternative are discussed below. No development would occur in the proposed CES and WC sites under this alternative and no new access roadway off of Atwood Road would be necessary.

Alternative 6: Children's Emergency Shelter and Women's Center Harmon Parcel

The Harmon Parcel is an offsite alternative location for the CES and WC facilities. This site is located north of Bell Road, at the location of the northern terminus of Richardson Drive and it consists of approximately ten acres of undeveloped but previously disturbed land. A portion of the site is designated MU (mixed use) while the majority of the site is designated LDR (low density residential). The site is zoned for multi-family development. These designations are consistent with the proposed uses of the CES and WC. This alternative would place all of the proposed CES and WC facilities at this location, with access provided via Richardson Drive. No development would occur in the proposed CES and WC site under this alternative and no new access roadway off of Atwood Road would be necessary.

Alternative 7: Building and Facility Demolition No Project Alternative

The No Project alternative for the proposed building demolition would alter Phases A and F and would eliminate Phases H and J from the proposed project. These actions would preclude demolition of the wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) facilities, Buildings 15 through 18, Buildings 204B, 205B, 206B, 207A&B, and Buildings 212A&B through 217A&B. Buildings proposed for demolition at the LDB site (Buildings 1 through 8) would still be demolished to accommodate the LDB and associated parking.

16.4 ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES TO DEWITT GOVERNMENT CENTER FACILITY PLAN

The following is an analysis of the seven alternatives described above. This section provides a comparative analysis of project impacts and those associated with implementation of these alternatives. The analysis concludes with a table comparing the significance of impacts under the proposed project and each alternative, a determination as to which is the environmentally superior alternative, a discussion of which alternatives have been rejected in favor of the proposed project, and a discussion one alternative that has been determined to be environmentally superior to the proposed project.

Alternative 1: Land Development Building No Project Alternative***Land Use and Housing***

Under Alternative 1, the LDB site would not be changed from its existing conditions. The site would continue to support Buildings 1 through 8, although the uses of those buildings would change, and existing vegetation would not be substantially altered. The housing relocation plan for Buildings 2 through 5, which has already been approved by the Placer County Board of Supervisors, would still be implemented, vacating those buildings for other County uses.

However, those buildings are not designed for office space use and would require remodeling. Additionally, those buildings do not conform to current building codes and are not seismically sound. Transferring office uses to the residential buildings would require expansion of existing parking facilities, which would occur in areas currently supporting vegetation.

The EIR found no significant impacts related to Land Use and Housing as a result of the proposed project. There is no preference between the Alternative 1 and Phases A and B of the Proposed Project.

Aesthetics

The LDB site supports approximately 120 large trees, most of which are non-native species. The proposed project would preserve approximately 22 of the existing trees. Under Alternative 1, all trees would be preserved, with the exception of possible impacts to up to ten trees as a result of parking lot expansion to accommodate transfer of office uses to the residential buildings. This would reduce somewhat the extent of *Impact 5.1 – Damage to Scenic Resources* at the LDB site. Additionally, this alternative would substantially reduce the amount of site disturbance at the LDB site, thus reducing the extent of *Impact 5.2 – Degradation of Existing Visual Character of the Site*. Site disturbance associated with the proposed LDB construction would noticeably alter the character of the site in the short-term, until new landscaping is established. The Land Development Building No Project Alternative would avoid alteration of the existing landscaping and reduce Impact 5.2 to a less than significant level. Since Alternative 1 lessens both of these impacts, it is preferred over the Proposed Project – Phases A and B.

Transportation and Circulation

The proposed project was not found to have any significant impacts with respect to transportation and circulation. The proposed LDB would accommodate 87 new employees by 2010, which would not generate significant numbers of new traffic trips. Alternative 1 has no substantial change on the level of impact over the Proposed Project – Phase B. Therefore there is no preference between Alternative 1 and Phase A and B of the Proposed Project.

Air Quality

The demolition at the LDB site (Phase A) and construction of the proposed LDB (Phase B) were found to have potentially significant impacts related to emissions of NO_x. Elimination of the demolition of Buildings 1 through 8 and the construction of the LDB would eliminate all emissions associated with these activities, thus avoiding this impact. Alternative 1 is preferred over the Proposed Project – Phases A and B.

Noise

Under this alternative, noise would still be produced during construction, demolition, and operation of the rest of DeWitt Center development, but no construction, demolition, and operation noises associated with the LDB would occur. Sensitive receptors that would no longer be exposed to significant impacts as a result of demolition or construction activities associated with the LDB development include the convalescent housing to the northwest, residences to the east, west, and north, medical centers to the north and northeast, Rock Creek School to the northeast, Foothill Community Church to the southeast, and the clinic to the southeast. Many of these receptors would continue to be impacted by the demolition of

Buildings 15 through 18, which are immediately south of the LDB site. However, these would be short-term impacts occurring only during November and December of 2005. Since noise impacts are lessened under Alternative 1, it is preferred over the Proposed Project – Phases A and B.

Biological Resources

The proposed LDB site supports limited biological resources, including approximately 120 trees (primarily non-native) and lawn areas. The site does not provide significant habitat for wildlife. One of the three existing oak trees at this site is anticipated to be preserved under the proposed project. Impacts of the proposed project on biological resources would be less than significant. Implementation of Alternative 1 would have no change on the level of impact. There is no preference between Alternative 1 and the Proposed Project – Phases A and B.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

Limited grading is expected to occur under Phases A and B of the proposed project. The grading represents a less than significant impact of the proposed project. DeWitt Center is located in an area characterized by low to moderate seismic activity, and the LDB site soils are capable of supporting structures. No significant impacts related to safety with respect to geology are associated with Phases A and B of the proposed project. No changes to the level of impacts associated with Phases A and B would occur under Alternative 1. Therefore, there is no preference between Alternative 1 and the Proposed Project – Phases A and B.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Eliminating the construction of the LDB from the proposed DeWitt Government Center Facility Plan would reduce the overall project impacts of grading and expansion of impervious surface at DeWitt Center. Approximately one-half of the proposed ± 8.8 -acre LDB site is currently developed with impervious surface. After development, approximately two-thirds of the site would be developed with impervious surface, therefore elimination of the LDB would reduce new impervious surface in the project area by ± 1.5 acres compared with the proposed project. Therefore, under Alternative 1, sources of impacts to surface water and groundwater quality would be nearly the same as under Phases A and B of the proposed project. Overall there is no preference between Alternative 1 and the Proposed Project – Phases A and B.

Cultural Resources

Historical Resources

Under this alternative, the LDB component of the project would not be constructed. Eliminating the LDB component of the project would eliminate the need to demolish the following contributing features of the DeWitt General Hospital Historic District:

- Building 1: Administration Building
- Buildings 2, 3, 4, and 5: Officers' and Nurses Residences
- Building 7: Officers' Club
- Building 8: Mess Room for Officers

Alternative 1 also reduces the addition of non-contributing features (new buildings and parking lots) within the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historic Places-eligible Historic District. The addition of non-contributing features in a Historic District lessens the integrity of the district.

Under this alternative impacts to the eligible Historic District are reduced (reduced demolition of contributing features and reduced addition of intrusive modern features); therefore, Alternative 1 is preferred to the Phases A and B of the proposed project.

Archaeological Resources

Alternative 1 eliminates the ground disturbing activity at the proposed LDB site, which correspondingly reduces the likelihood of encountering buried archaeological resources during project implementation. Impacts to archaeological resources would thus be reduced under this alternative. Therefore, Alternative 1 is preferred to the proposed project.

Public Facilities

The proposed LDB would accommodate 87 new employees by 2010. The EIR analysis found that sufficient capacity is available to provide water supply, wastewater treatment, and utility services to the LDB site and that the incremental increases in demands for fire protection, law enforcement, school services, and solid waste generation would result in less than significant impacts on the provision of those services in the project vicinity. Additionally, the proposed new construction would incorporate fixtures and design elements that would allow a more efficient use of some services, such as water supply, wastewater treatment, and utilities. The elimination of some building demolition and construction under Alternative 1 would lessen the generation of solid waste. However, overall there is no substantial difference in impacts to public facilities between the proposed LDB and Alternative 1. Therefore, there is no preference between Alternative 1 and Phases A and B of the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under this alternative, the LDB component of the project would not be constructed, resulting in minor reductions in demolition of buildings that potentially contain asbestos and lead based paint. The LUST site identified at Building 8 would not be tested or disturbed as part of the project. The open LUST site would remain the responsibility of the Corps. The potential to disturb soil containing naturally occurring asbestos during site grading and preparation would be reduced.

The existing structures at the proposed LDB site are very likely to contain asbestos and lead-based paint. Under the proposed development alternative, these structures would be demolished after the abatement of asbestos containing materials and lead-based paint. If the LDB site is not developed and the structures remain, there is the potential to have an impact from asbestos and lead-based paint being introduced to the site soil under the existing conditions. Given this consideration, Phases A and B of the proposed project are preferred over Alternative 1.

Alternative 2: Auburn Justice Center No Project Alternative***Land Use and Housing***

The AJC site is currently vacant and characterized by a high level of previous disturbance (grading, removal of vegetation). Under Alternative 2, the site would remain in its current condition. The development of the AJC poses no significant impacts with respect to land use. The site is zoned C3-Dc (heavy commercial, design scenic corridor) and designated for mixed use development. Maintenance of the site in its vacant and disturbed condition would not be consistent with the development vision for DeWitt Center as expressed in the *Auburn/Bowman Community Plan*, the *Placer County General Plan*, and the *Placer County Zoning Ordinance*. Therefore Phase C of the proposed project is preferred to Alternative 2.

Aesthetics

The vacant and disturbed AJC site contains only two native trees and scattered vegetation associated with the wetland swale in the southern portion of the site. As such, this site does not provide any significant visual resources. Development of the AJC at this site in compliance with the County's design guidelines represents a less than significant impact to aesthetics at DeWitt Center. Alternative 2 would maintain the site in its existing conditions. There is no preference between Alternative 2 and Phase C of the proposed project.

Transportation and Circulation

The proposed project was not found to have any significant impacts with respect to transportation and circulation. The proposed AJC would accommodate 29 new employees by 2010, which would not generate significant numbers of new traffic trips. Alternative 2 has no substantial change on the level of impact over the Proposed Project – Phase C. Therefore there is no preference between Alternative 2 and Phase C of the proposed project.

Air Quality

Significant emissions of NO_x are anticipated to result from site preparation and construction at the AJC site. Under the Auburn Justice Center No Project alternative, no site preparation or construction would occur at this site, thus eliminating the NO_x emissions. Therefore, Alternative 2 is preferred over Proposed Project – Phase C.

Noise

Under this alternative, noise associated with construction of the AJC would be eliminated from the proposed project. Sensitive receptors that would no longer be exposed to significant impacts include the existing Sierra Council on Alcoholism and shelter to the east, the minimum security area to the southeast, and the Juvenile Hall to the west. Since noise impacts are reduced under Alternative 2, it is preferred over the Proposed Project – Phase C.

Biological Resources

The AJC site provides only limited biological resources, including two native trees and a small wetland swale. Impacts to the trees and swale were found to be significant and are mitigated in the proposed project through tree replacement and a wetland creation/restoration program. Under Alternative 2, the trees and wetland swale would be preserved. Therefore, Alternative 2 is preferred to Phase C of the proposed project.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

The AJC site requires moderate grading to provide a level building site. Approximately 12,500 cubic yards of soil would be moved during site preparation. The preliminary grading plans indicate cut and fill banks of up to ten feet in height. Additionally, potential impacts related to the stability of the existing stockpiled soil on the site could occur. Alternative 2 eliminates the need for all site preparation and any risks associated with soil stability by avoiding construction of the AJC. Therefore Alternative 2 is preferred to Phase C of the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Elimination of construction of the AJC would reduce the impacts of project grading and the corresponding amount of impervious surface. The AJC site is currently vacant and contains very little impervious surface. Phase C of the proposed project would result in development of approximately nine acres of impervious surfaces. Overall, potential sources of impacts to surface water and groundwater quality throughout DeWitt Center would be essentially the same under Alternative 3 as under the proposed project. Even though runoff rate and volume would be less than for the proposed project, mitigation measures would be similar and the resulting impacts essentially the same. Overall there is no clear preference between Alternative 2 and the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

Historical Resources

Under this alternative, the AJC component of the project would not be constructed. The AJC site is located outside of the identified Historic District boundary and does not require demolition of any existing buildings. There is no clear preference between Alternative 2 and the proposed project with respect to historical resources.

Archaeological Resources

As the cumulative footprint of the proposed projects would be reduced with this alternative, the amount of ground disturbing activity necessary is likewise reduced. Decreased construction correspondingly reduces the likelihood of encountering buried archaeological resources during project implementation. Impacts to archaeological resources would thus be reduced with the No AJC alternative. Therefore, Alternative 2 is preferred to the proposed project.

Public Facilities

The proposed AJC would accommodate 29 new employees by 2010. The EIR analysis found that sufficient capacity is available to provide water supply, wastewater treatment, and utility services to the AJC site and that the incremental increases in demands for fire protection, school services, and solid waste generation would result in less than significant impacts on the provision of those services in the project vicinity. Additionally, the proposed new construction would incorporate fixtures and design elements that would allow a more efficient use of some services, such as water supply, wastewater treatment, and utilities. Overall there is no substantial difference in impacts to public facilities between the proposed AJC and Alternative 2. Therefore, there is no clear preference between Alternative 2 and Phase C of the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under this alternative, the AJC component would not be constructed and the potential to disturb soil containing naturally occurring asbestos during site grading and preparation would be reduced. All other construction and demolition included in the proposed project would proceed, including demolition of buildings adjacent to known hazardous materials sites (i.e., underground storage tanks). The site investigation and remediation of these sites would occur under this alternative. Since potential impacts from grading are reduced and all other impacts remain the same with Alternative 2, it is preferred to the proposed project.

Alternative 3: 14-Acre Site, Land Development Building and/or Auburn Justice Center

Land Use and Housing

No significant land use impacts are anticipated to occur with development of the LDB or AJC as proposed. The 14-Acre site is zoned and designated for mixed use development, and the development vision for this area, as expressed in the *Auburn/Bowman Community Plan*, calls for development of mixed use/retail land uses. Therefore, locating either the LDB or AJC at this site would represent an inconsistency with the local land use plan, which would be a significant impact of this alternative. Phase B or C of the proposed project is preferred over Alternative 3.

Aesthetics

Significant impacts to aesthetics associated with Phases B and C of the proposed project result from removal of existing trees and vegetation and short-term impacts of site disturbance at the LDB site. The AJC site is already heavily disturbed. The 14-Acre site supports approximately 109 trees (a mixture of native and non-native) along a wetland swale that runs from the center of the site to the northeast corner, and approximately 30 additional trees along the southern boundary of the site. Although a site plan for this alternative has not been developed, it is anticipated that location of either the LDB or the AJC at this site would require removal of approximately 100 trees, which is significantly more trees than would be removed at either of the proposed sites. Site disturbance impacts at the alternative site would be about the same as at the LDB site, and would be greater than at the AJC site. With respect to both impacts, the proposed project is preferred to Alternative 3.

Transportation and Circulation

As stated above, Phases B and C of the proposed project were not found to have any significant impacts with respect to transportation and circulation. Alternative 3 would not alter the numbers of employees housed in either the LDB or the AJC, nor would it change the parking requirements, or impacts to alternative transportation. However, the alternative location for either project component would be expected to alter circulation patterns in the area, likely increasing the amount of traffic using the future extension of Willow Creek Drive. Additionally, as this alternative site is located approximately one-third of a mile from the existing Juvenile Hall and Main Jail, this site may increase traffic trips internal to DeWitt Center as justice department employees travel between the AJC and the detention facilities. This site is approximately one-quarter mile from the Finance Administration Building. This may also increase traffic trips internal to DeWitt Center as members of the public travel between the LDB and the financial departments (i.e., the Assessor's Office) located at the Finance Administration Building. Given these considerations, Alternative 3 would result in a slight increase in the level

of impact over the Proposed Project – Phases B and/or C. Therefore the Proposed Project is preferred over Alternative 3.

Air Quality

Significant impacts are anticipated to occur under the proposed project during site preparation and construction of each project component. The alternative location will not change the level of pollutant emissions. Sensitive receptors, including residential land uses, exist in proximity to the 14-Acre site and would be exposed to pollutant emissions during construction. There is no change in impacts between Phases B and/or C of the proposed project and Alternative 3.

Noise

Construction

As described under the proposed project, noise would result from the operation of construction equipment used during construction of the LDB or AJC, either at their proposed locations or at the adjacent 14-Acre site. Sensitive receptors and office buildings in direct line-of-sight within 500 feet of construction at the adjacent 14-Acre vacant site may experience sound levels above 75 dBA. The sensitive receptors near the 14-Acre site include the Foothill Community Church to the northwest, the day-use clinic to the northwest, the children's Emergency Shelter to the west, the senior center to the west, the Charis Youth Center to the west, and residences to the south. To minimize the potential for adverse impacts, the construction contractor would be required to take measures to reduce construction as described under the Proposed Project.

There are fewer sensitive receptors, particularly residences, that would be impacted if the LDB is constructed at the 14-Acre site. Therefore, construction of the LDB under Alternative 3 is preferred over Phase B of the proposed project. The number of sensitive receptors that would be impacted during construction of the AJC at the 14-Acre site is similar to the impact under Phase C of the proposed project. Therefore, there is no clear preference between Proposed Project – Phase C and construction of the AJC under Alternative 3.

Operation

Project-related noise levels along the roadways under location of either the LDB or the AJC at the 14-Acre site are expected to be similar to those described under the proposed project. Since the contribution of vehicular traffic as a result of the project is not detectable, the impact would be insignificant. No operational impacts are expected under Phases B and C of the proposed project or under Alternative 3. Hence, there is no clear preference between them.

Biological Resources

As discussed under Aesthetics, the 14-Acre site supports approximately 140 trees, of which approximately 70 are native and fall under the protection of the Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance. The 14-Acre site also supports isolated wetland features. Development of either the LDB or the AJC at this site is likely to impact a majority of the biological resources at this site. The proposed sites for the LDB and AJC provide only limited biological resources, although impacts to those resources under the proposed project require mitigation. Development of the LDB or AJC under Alternative 3 would result in greater impacts to biological resources than under the proposed project. Phases B and C of the proposed project are therefore preferred over Alternative 3.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

Development of the LDB at the 14-Acre site is expected to require greater site preparation than at the proposed location based on the existing development and topography of the proposed site. The 14-Acre site ranges in elevation from 1,425 feet in the southwest corner of the site to approximately 1,390 feet at the northeast end. This elevation range is expected to require larger cuts and fills than are anticipated at the proposed LDB site. Regional geography is expected to be the same as at the proposed site. Based on the need for additional grading and larger cuts and fills, development of the LDB at the 14-Acre site is expected to have greater impacts to geology than the proposed project. Therefore, Proposed Project – Phase B is preferred to development of the LDB under Alternative 3.

Development of the AJC at the 14-Acre site is expected to require relatively the same amount of site preparation and the same sizes of cuts and fills as at the proposed site. Therefore there is no preference between Phase C of the proposed project and development of the AJC under Alternative 3.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The 14-Acre site is located within the Rock Creek watershed. As above, it is assumed that the amount of ground disturbing activity required for development of the LDB under this alternative would be greater than that required for the proposed LDB site, while the amount of ground disturbing activity for development of the AJC under Alternative 3 would be equal to that under the proposed project.

Prior to implementation of mitigation measures, impacts to surface water runoff rates and volume and to water quality for development of the LDB would be less at the proposed LDB site than under Alternative 3. Mitigation measures described for the proposed project could be designed to reduce the level of impact to less than significant. Since the proposed site lessens the extent of the needed mitigation measures, Proposed Project – Phase B is preferred to Alternative 3.

Impacts to surface water runoff rates and volume and to water quality for development of the AJC would be essentially the same at the proposed AJC site as under Alternative 3, and would require a similar extent of mitigation to reduce the impact to less than significant levels. Therefore, there is no preference between Proposed Project – Phase C and Alternative 3.

This site is located near an open section of the Kemper Canal. Depending on how the site would be regraded, the County may be required to encase or otherwise protect a portion of the canal in accordance with NID guidance for development of either the LDB or the AJC at this site. This would represent a potentially significant impact of Alternative 3 that does not exist under the proposed project. Mitigation measures would be available to reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Therefore this impact does not significantly alter the preference or lack thereof for the proposed project versus Alternative 3.

Cultural Resources

Historical Resources

The 14-Acre site is included within the DeWitt General Hospital Historic District boundary and contains contributing features to the historic district (Water Treatment Plant, Combie 3 Canal [Kemper Canal], Pump House, and Flume).

Construction of the LDB on the 14-Acre site would require the demolition of the four contributing features (listed above) within the Historic District, rather than the demolition of eight contributing features under the proposed project. Impacts as a result of the addition of non-contributing features (new buildings, roads, and parking lots) within the Historic District are the same under this alternative as the proposed project. Since the amount of demolition to contributing features within the Historic District is reduced, development of the LDB under Alternative 3 is preferred to the Phase B of the proposed project.

Construction of the AJC on the 14-Acre site would require the demolition of the four contributing features (listed above) within the Historic District. The proposed AJC site is located outside of the Historic District and does not require demolition of any historic features. Construction of the AJC on the 14-Acre site would result in an increased amount of demolition to contributing features of the Historic District and an increase in intrusive modern structures and non-contributing features (roads and parking lots) within the Historic District. Therefore, Phase C of the proposed project is preferred to development of the AJC under Alternative 3.

Archaeological Resources

Although a design for this alternative has not been developed, it is assumed that the amount of ground disturbing activity required for this alternative is equal to that required for the proposed project. A record search and field survey revealed that no archaeological resources have been identified on the adjacent 14-Acre parcel (Home Depot 2003). Impacts to archaeological resources with the movement of the LDB or AJC projects to the adjacent 14-Acre parcel alternative are thus equal to that of the preferred alternative. Overall there is no clear preference between Alternative 3 and the proposed project.

Public Facilities

No significant impacts to public facilities are anticipated to result from development of the LDB and AJC under the proposed project. Relocation of either facility to the 14-Acre site would not change the level of impacts to public facilities. There is no preference between Proposed Project - Phases B and C and Alternative 3.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The 14-Acre site includes three buildings that potentially contain asbestos and lead based paint. The proposed LDB site contains seven buildings that potentially contain asbestos and lead based paint. (The LDB site contains eight existing buildings, one of which is temporary and was constructed more recently than the brick buildings, therefore has very low potential to contain hazardous building materials.) The AJC site contains no existing buildings, and no known hazards or hazardous materials.

Construction of the LDB on the 14-Acre site would reduce the amount of demolition of buildings that potentially contain asbestos and lead based paint from seven large buildings to three smaller buildings. At either site, building demolition would be preceded by abatement of asbestos containing materials and lead-based paint. Under Alternative 3, the abatement would not occur at the LDB site, and the potential impacts to site soil from the presence of asbestos and lead-based paint that exist under the current conditions would remain. Additionally, the LUST site identified at Building 8 would not be disturbed, therefore testing and remedial actions would not occur as part of the project. Given this consideration, Proposed Project - Phase B is preferred to Alternative 3 for the LDB since under the proposed project the existing conditions would be remediated.

Construction of either the LDB or the AJC at the 14-Acre alternative site would result in the same potential to disturb soil containing naturally occurring asbestos during site grading and preparation as under Phase B or C of the proposed project. Mitigation measures developed for the proposed project would be implemented for Alternative 3 reducing the level of potential impact to that of less than significant. As there are no existing structures or hazardous materials at the AJC site, no remediation of existing hazards would occur under the proposed project. Relocation of the AJC to the 14-Acre site would require abatement of asbestos containing materials and lead based paint at the alternative site. Therefore, Alternative 3 for the AJC is preferred to Phase C of the proposed project.

Alternative 4: Children's Emergency Shelter and Women's Center No Project Alternative ***Land Use and Housing***

The CES and WC sites are currently vacant and characterized by the presence of a portion of the onsite oak woodland habitat and several piles of debris, most of which are overgrown with vegetation. Under Alternative 4, the sites would remain in their current condition. The development of the CES and WC projects poses no significant impacts with respect to land use. The sites are zoned OP-DR-Dc (Office Professional, Design Review, Design Scenic Corridor) and designated for mixed use development. Maintenance of the sites in their vacant and disturbed condition would not be consistent with the development vision for DeWitt Center as expressed in the *Auburn/Bowman Community Plan*, the *Placer County General Plan*, and the *Placer County Zoning Ordinance*, and would require the continued location of these residential-type facilities within the office and commercial areas of DeWitt Center. Therefore, Phase D of the proposed project is preferred to Alternative 4.

Aesthetics

Significant impacts to aesthetics associated with Phase D of the proposed project result from removal of existing trees and vegetation. Elimination of the CES and WC facilities from the proposed project would avoid these impacts. Therefore, Alternative 4 is preferred over the Proposed Project - Phase D.

Transportation and Circulation

Phase D of the proposed project was not found to have any significant impacts with respect to traffic trip generation but was found to have a potentially significant impact with respect to creation of a safety hazard. The proposed CES and WC projects would accommodate five new clients at the CES, 27 new clients at the WC, and total of 13 new employees by 2010. These

increases would not generate significant numbers of new traffic trips. The proposed access driveway off of Atwood Road was found to have inadequate sight distance to the east. Alternative 4 would eliminate the need for the access driveway, therefore eliminating this impact and the need for implementation of *Mitigation Measure 6.1a*. Thus Alternative 4 is preferred over Phase D of the Proposed Project.

Air Quality

Significant emissions of NO_x are anticipated to result from site preparation and construction at the CES and WC sites. Under the Alternative 4, no site preparation or construction would occur at these sites, thus eliminating the NO_x emissions. Therefore, Alternative 4 is preferred over Proposed Project – Phase D.

Noise

Under this alternative, noise would not be produced during construction and operation of the CES and WC facilities. Sensitive receptors that would no longer be impacted include residences to the south, north, and northeast, the Juvenile Hall to the east, and the Main Jail to the east. Since there are less noise impacts under Alternative 4, it is preferred over the Phase D of the proposed project.

Biological Resources

The proposed CES and WC sites support approximately seven acres of oak woodland habitat and are adjacent to the wetland habitats associated with the larger of the open water ponds at DeWitt Center. Development at the proposed sites would directly impact approximately one acre of the oak woodland and could impact the wetland habitats, and provision of infrastructure to serve the site would impact approximately 35 trees adjacent to Atwood Road. Under Alternative 4, no changes from the existing conditions would occur in this area, therefore no impacts to the biological resources at these sites would occur. Alternative 4 is preferred to Proposed Project – Phase D.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

The Children's Emergency Shelter and Women's Center No Project Alternative would eliminate all grading and earth moving required for provision of infrastructure, including the access driveway off of Atwood Road, and for construction of the CES and WC facilities. This would eliminate all impacts related to geology and soils at the CES and WC sites. Therefore Alternative 4 is preferred to Phase D of the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

By eliminating the grading and construction associated with the CES and WC facilities, no impacts to hydrology and water quality would occur under this alternative. This would eliminate the need for implementation of mitigation measures identified for Phase D of the proposed project. Alternative 4 is preferred over Proposed Project – Phase D.

Cultural Resources

Historical Resources

The CES and WC sites are not located within the Historic District boundary. No demolition is associated with these project components. No impacts to historical resources are associated with the proposed CES and WC projects; this would not change under Alternative 4. There is no preference between Alternative 4 and the proposed project.

Archaeological Resources

Implementation of Alternative 4 would eliminate the ground disturbing activity necessary at the CES and WC sites. Decreased construction correspondingly reduces the likelihood of encountering buried archaeological resources during project implementation. Impacts to archaeological resources would thus be reduced with the Children's Emergency Shelter and Women's Center No Project Alternative. Therefore, Alternative 4 is preferred to Phase D of the proposed project.

Public Facilities

No significant impacts to provision of public services and facilities to the CES and WC sites are associated with the project as proposed. Elimination of the CES and WC facilities would not change the impacts. There is no preference between Proposed Project - Phase D and Alternative 4.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

There are no existing structures or known hazards or hazardous materials present at the proposed CES and WC sites. Implementation of the Children's Emergency Shelter and Women's Center No Project Alternative would eliminate the potential to disturb soil containing naturally occurring asbestos during site grading and preparation at the proposed CES and WC sites. Since potential impacts from grading are reduced with this scenario, Alternative 4 is preferred to Phase D of the proposed project.

Alternative 5: Children's Emergency Shelter and Women's Center Pasture Site

Land Use and Housing

The proposed CES and WC sites and the pasture site are all zoned OP-DR-Dc (Office Professional, Design Review, Design Scenic Corridor) and designated for mixed use development. The development of the CES and WC projects as proposed poses no significant impacts with respect to land use. Relocation of the CES and WC facilities to the Pasture Site would not result in any changes to this determination. There is no preference between Phase D of the proposed project and Alternative 5.

Aesthetics

The CES and WC sites support a portion of the onsite oak woodland habitat. The Pasture Site is characterized by the presence of scattered oak trees and grasslands. That site is visible from adjacent rural residential land uses, but not from Atwood Road. Relocation of the CES and WC facilities to this site would result in removal of fewer trees than at the proposed sites. It would also eliminate the need for installation of infrastructure along Atwood Road, thereby preserving 35 additional trees adjacent to that roadway. Under this alternative, infrastructure would be

extended along B Avenue and would impact very few trees. As the proposed CES and WC facilities will be constructed with a rural residential atmosphere, the construction of these facilities in sight of the existing rural residential developments north and west of the site would be a less than significant impact. Based on the reduction in impacts to trees, Alternative 5 is preferred to Phase D of the proposed project.

Transportation and Circulation

As stated above, Phase D of the proposed project was not found to have any significant impacts with respect to traffic trip generation but was found to have a potentially significant impact with respect to creation of a safety hazard. Alternative 5 results in no substantial change to traffic trip generation for the proposed CES and WC facilities, but would eliminate the need for the access driveway off of Atwood Road. The Pasture Site location would be accessed via an extension of B Avenue across the riparian wetland associated with the onsite open water pond. Topography in this area is relatively flat, and no impacts related to sight distance or other safety hazards are expected to occur in this location. As Alternative 5 reduces the level of impact over the Proposed Project – Phase D and eliminates the need for implementation of *Mitigation Measure 6.1a*, Alternative 5 is preferred over the proposed project.

Air Quality

Significant emissions of NO_x are anticipated to result from site preparation and construction of the CES and WC facilities. Construction of these facilities at the Pasture Site would require similar amounts of grading and construction activities. The Pasture Site is closer to the sensitive receptors in the residential areas north and west of that site, but is further from the residences south of the proposed CES and WC sites. Therefore there is no significant change in the level of exposure of sensitive receptors to air pollutants. As pollutant emissions are expected to be similar for each site, there is no preference between Proposed Project – Phase D and Alternative 5.

Noise

Construction

Noise would occur during the operation of equipment used during construction of the CES and WC projects at either the proposed sites or the Pasture Site. Sensitive receptors (i.e., residences) in direct line-of-sight within 500 feet of construction at the Pasture Site could experience sound levels above 75 dBA. At the proposed CES and WC sites, sensitive receptors identified in the EIR as potentially experiencing sound levels above 75 dBA were limited to residences to the south. Anticipated noise levels at other nearby sensitive receptors are less than 75 dba. Relocation of the CES and WC projects to the Pasture Site would move the construction equipment further from the sensitive receptors to the south and east, and closer to residences to the north and northeast, and to a church to the northeast. This would not change the level of impact associated with the proposed CES and WC sites. At either site, mitigation measures would require the construction contractor to take measures to minimize the potential for adverse impacts. Thus, there is no preference between Proposed Project – Phase D and Alternative 5.

Operation

Project-related noise levels along the roadways under this alternative are expected to be similar to those described under the proposed project. Since the contribution of vehicular traffic as a result of the project is not detectable, the impact would be insignificant. No operational impacts are expected under the proposed project or this alternative, therefore, there is no preference between Phase D of the proposed project and Alternative 5.

Biological Resources

The proposed CES and WC sites support a portion of the oak woodland habitat at DeWitt Center. Construction of these facilities as proposed would directly impact approximately one acre of this habitat, and would serve to reduce the habitat value across the seven-acre site. Extension of infrastructure to the proposed CES and WC sites would impact approximately 35 trees along Atwood Road. The Pasture Site supports scattered oak trees and grassland, and has been used recently as a horse pasture. While the Pasture Site does contain some biological resources, the oak woodland habitat provides greater wildlife value than the pasture. Additionally, construction at this site and extension of infrastructure to the site would result in the loss of fewer trees than at the proposed site. Therefore, the Pasture Site Alternative 5 is preferred to Phase D of the proposed project.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

Although a design for this alternative has not been developed, it is assumed that the amount of grading and earth moving required for Alternative 5 would be equal to that proposed for the proposed CES and WC sites, with the exception of grading associated with extension of infrastructure along Atwood Road. Impacts to geology and soils would be slightly less under Alternative 5 as the extension of infrastructure (including extension of B Avenue) would require less grading than at the proposed site. Therefore, Alternative 5 is preferred over Proposed Project – Phase D.

Hydrology and Water Quality

As above, it is assumed that the amount of ground disturbing activity required for this alternative would be roughly equal to that at the proposed CES and WC sites. Amounts of impervious surfaces following construction are also anticipated to be roughly equal. Impacts to surface water rates and volume and to water quality would be essentially the same as those identified for the proposed project. The mitigation measures described for the proposed site would also be necessary at the Pasture Site. Therefore, there is no preference between Alternative 5 and Phase D of the proposed project.

The Pasture Site is located near an open section of the Ophir Canal. Depending on the topography of the site in relation to the canal and how the site would be graded, a portion of the canal may be required to be encased or protected in accordance with NID guidance and *Placer County General Plan* policy. Because this mitigation would be required, impacts to the canal would be less than significant.

Cultural Resources

Historical Resources

Neither the proposed CES and WC sites nor the pasture site is located within the Historic District boundary. No demolition is associated with any of these sites. Therefore neither the proposed sites nor the pasture site would result impacts to historical resources and there is preference between Alternative 5 and Phase D of the proposed project.

Archaeological Resources

Although a design for the this alternative has not been developed, it is assumed that the amount of ground disturbing activity required for this alternative is equal to that proposed for the preferred alternative. Both the proposed CES and WC sites and the Pasture Site were included in the record search and field surveys for the *DeWitt Center Existing Conditions Report* (NFA/URS 2002). No archaeological resources have been identified at any of these sites although there could be resources discovered below the surface of the ground during construction activities. Impacts to archaeological resources would be the same under the proposed project as under Alternative 5. Overall there is no preference between Alternative 5 and Phase D of the proposed project.

Public Facilities

No significant impacts to provision of public services and facilities to the CES and WC sites are associated with the project as proposed. Relocation of the CES and WC facilities to the Pasture Site would not change the impacts. There is no preference between Proposed Project – Phase D and Alternative 5.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under this alternative, site grading and excavation operations would likely be similar to those for the proposed CES and WC sites. Potential impacts associated with construction and operation would be essentially the same as those identified for the proposed project. Mitigation measures developed for the proposed project would be implemented for Alternative 5 to reduce the level of potential impact to that of less than significant. Therefore, there is no preference between Alternative 5 and the Phase D of the proposed project.

Alternative 6: Children's Emergency Shelter and Women's Center Harmon Parcel

Land Use and Housing

There are no significant land use impacts associated with the proposed CES and WC sites. The Harmon Parcel is zoned for multi-family development and designated for both mixed use and low density residential development. The proposed CES and WC facilities would be consistent with these land use designations. However, the Harmon Parcel is within the Airport Land Use Compatibility Zone C2, which prohibits risk-sensitive uses such as schools and residential facilities for children and the elderly. Therefore the CES would not be compatible with this designation and location of these facilities at the Harmon Parcel would create a significant land use impact. Phase D of the proposed project is preferred to Alternative 6.

Aesthetics

The Harmon Parcel is vacant land that was previously graded. Very few trees or other scenic resources exist at this site. Development of the CES and WC projects under this alternative would result in fewer impacts to scenic resources than at the proposed site. Therefore, Alternative 6 is preferred to Proposed Project – Phase D.

Transportation and Circulation

As stated above, Phase D of the proposed project was not found to have any significant impacts with respect to traffic trip generation but was found to have a potentially significant impact with respect to creation of a safety hazard. Alternative 6 has no substantial change on traffic trip generation of the proposed CES and WC facilities, but would eliminate the need for the access driveway off of Atwood Road. The Harmon Parcel location would be accessed via the existing extension of Richardson Drive. As this is an existing roadway, no impacts related to safety hazards are expected to exist in this location. Alternative 6 is preferred over the Proposed Project – Phase D because it reduces the level of impact and eliminates the need for implementation of *Mitigation Measure 6.1a*.

Air Quality

Significant emissions of NO_x are anticipated to result from site preparation and construction of the CES and WC facilities at either the proposed sites or the Harmon Parcel. Both sites would require similar amounts of grading and construction activities, so pollutant emissions are expected to be similar for each site. The Harmon Parcel is adjacent to greater numbers of sensitive receptors, including residential areas west and south of that site, as well as medical offices and residential care facilities south and east of that site. Therefore development at the Harmon Parcel would likely result in a greater exposure of sensitive receptors to air pollutants. Development under Phase D of the proposed project is preferred to Alternative 6.

Noise

Construction

As stated above, development at the proposed CES and WC sites would expose residences to the south of the sites to noise levels greater than 75 dBA. Receptors and office buildings in direct line-of-sight within 500 feet of construction at the Harmon Parcel may experience sound levels above 75 dBA. This would include residences to the east, west, south, and southwest, a church to the south, and a medical center to the east. As for the proposed CES and WC sites, the construction contractor would be required to take measures to minimize the potential for adverse impacts. Proposed Project – Phase D is preferred over Alternative 6 because the residences adjacent to the potential construction sites are closer to the Harmon Parcel and thus may experience higher sound levels than the residences adjacent to the proposed site prior to implementation of mitigation measures.

Operation

Project-related noise levels along the roadways under this alternative are expected to be similar to those described under the proposed project. Since the contribution of vehicular traffic as a result of the project is not detectable, the impact would be insignificant. No operational impacts

are expected under the proposed project or this alternative, therefore, there is no preference between Alternative 6 and Phase D of the proposed project with respect to operational impacts.

Biological Resources

The proposed CES and WC sites are located within the oak woodland habitat at DeWitt Center. The Harmon Parcel has been previously graded and supports ruderal habitat (ruderal refers to habitat that has been or continues to be subjected to disturbance of the natural conditions). Development at this site would result in fewer impacts to wildlife habitat. Therefore Alternative 6 is preferred over Phase D of the proposed project.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

The Harmon Parcel is relatively flat, and has similar geologic features to conditions throughout DeWitt Center. Elevations on this site range between 1,400 feet and 1,360 feet. The extent of grading required to develop the CES and WC facilities at this site would be similar to the required grading at the proposed sites, with the exception of grading associated with provision of infrastructure. At the proposed sites, grading would occur along Atwood Road between the CES and WC access driveway and Richardson Drive to accommodate extension of infrastructure. At the Harmon Parcel, infrastructure extensions would occur across a shorter distance, thus reducing the total amount of grading needed. Impacts to geological resources would be slightly less at the Harmon Parcel compared to the proposed CES and WC sites. Therefore, Alternative 6 is preferred to Proposed Project – Phase D.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The Harmon Parcel is located in the Dry Creek watershed. Impacts to surface water rates and volume and to water quality would be essentially the same as those identified for the proposed project. Implementation of the same mitigation measures described for the proposed project would be necessary to reduce the level of impact at the Harmon Parcel to less than significant. There is no preference between Alternative 6 and the Phase D of the proposed project.

Cultural Resources

Historical Resources

The Harmon Parcel is not located within the DeWitt General Hospital Historic District and supports no existing structures. Impacts associated with the Children's Emergency Shelter and Women's Center Harmon Parcel Alternative are the same as those identified with the proposed CES and WC sites; therefore, there is no preference between Alternative 6 and Phase D of the proposed project.

Archaeological Resources

It does not appear that the Harmon parcel has ever been inventoried for archaeological resources. Given that the property is generally undeveloped it is possible that archaeological resources are exposed and relatively undisturbed within the project area. In addition, there always exists the possibility that previously unknown archaeological resources could be exposed during project construction. With an identical construction footprint to that of the proposed CES and WC facility development, impacts to archaeological resources would be

equal or greater under implementation of Alternative 6. Therefore, Proposed Project – Phase D is preferred to Alternative 6.

Public Facilities

There are no significant impacts to public services and facilities associated with the proposed CES and WC sites. The Harmon Parcel is located within or adjacent to the boundaries of all applicable service districts, and is zoned for multi-family development. Development of the CES and WC facilities at this site would not generate more demand for service than was anticipated in the *Placer County General Plan* and *Auburn/Bowman Community Plan* or than is anticipated to be associated with the proposed CES and WC sites. Therefore there is no preference between Alternative 6 and Phase D of the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Under this alternative, site grading and excavation operations would likely be similar to those for the proposed CES and WC sites. Potential impacts associated with construction and operation would be essentially the same as those identified for the proposed project. Implementation of the same mitigation measures developed for the proposed project would be necessary to reduce the potential impact under Alternative 6 to a less than significant level. Therefore, there is no preference between Alternative 6 and Phase D of the proposed project.

Alternative 7: Building Demolition No Project Alternative

Land Use and Housing

This alternative would eliminate building demolition associated with portions of Phases A and F all of Phases H and J of the proposed project. This would result in the preservation of the outdated barracks-style buildings. This is not consistent with the development vision of DeWitt Center expressed in the *Auburn/Bowman Community Plan*. Therefore, Alternative 7 would result in a significant land use impact, whereas the proposed project does not. The proposed building demolition in Phases A, F, H, and J are preferred to Alternative 7.

Aesthetics

While the buildings proposed for demolition are not considered scenic resources, implementation of mitigation measures requiring landscaping and/or covering of demolition areas is necessary under the proposed project to lessen any potentially significant aesthetic impacts. Elimination of the proposed building demolition would negate the need for these mitigation measures. However, this action would also preserve the existing buildings, which do not meet with the design guidelines and strategies for the project area as expressed in the *North Auburn Community Development Strategy and Design Guidelines*. Therefore, the Phases A, F, H, and J of the proposed project are preferred to Alternative 7.

Transportation and Circulation

The proposed building demolition would result in minor changes in circulation patterns around and throughout DeWitt Center but would not change the number of traffic trips generated by the land uses at DeWitt Center. Elimination of the proposed demolition would preserve the existing circulation patterns. The circulation pattern changes under the proposed project would not represent significant impacts because all intersections would still operate at acceptable

levels of service. There is no preference between Alternative 7 and Proposed Project – Phases A, F, H, and J.

Air Quality

Demolition included in Phases A (wastewater treatment plant facilities) and F (Buildings 15 through 18) is not expected to generate significant emissions, while demolition in Phases H (Buildings 204B, 205B, 206B, and 207A&B) and J (Buildings 212A&B and 217A&B) is expected to generate significant emissions of NO_x and emissions of SO_x that exceed the thresholds for implementation of mitigation measures. Elimination of the proposed demolitions would eliminate all significant and less than significant emissions associated with demolition activities. Therefore, Alternative 7 is preferred to Proposed Project – Phases A, F, H, and J.

Noise

Under this alternative, no impacts would occur as a result of demolition of the wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) facilities, Buildings 15 through 18, Buildings 201 through 207, and Buildings 211 through 217. No significant impacts to sensitive receptors are associated with demolition of the WWTP or Buildings 204B, 205B, 206B, and 207A&B, while the proposed demolition of Buildings 15 through 18 and Buildings 212A&B through 217A&B is expected to result in significant impacts to residences to the east of Buildings 15 through 18, the Senior Center, New Faith Community Church, and O'Brien Child Development Center south of Buildings 212A&B through 217A&B, and the day use clinic and Foothill Community Church north of these buildings. Elimination of the proposed demolition will avoid all impacts to these sensitive receptors. Since these impacts would be avoided, Alternative 7 is preferred over Phases A, F, H, and J of the proposed project.

Biological Resources

The buildings proposed for demolition provide very little wildlife value, with the exception of potential habitat for special status bat species. The proposed project requires implementation of a mitigation measure to provide replacement habitat for the bats. Elimination of the proposed building demolition would avoid this impact and negate the need for implementation of this mitigation measure. Therefore Alternative 7 is preferred to Phases A, F, H, and J of the proposed project.

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

Building demolition could increase risks of erosion if demolition sites are left with exposed ground. Implementation of mitigation requiring that demolitions sites be landscaped and/or covered is necessary to avoid this impact. Elimination of building demolition from the proposed project would avoid this impact and negate the need for mitigation. Alternative 7 is preferred to the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Building demolition could increase risks of sedimentation of drainageways due to increased erosion as described above. Implementation of mitigation requiring landscaping and/or covering of demolition sites is necessary to avoid this impact. Elimination of building demolition from the proposed project would avoid this impact and negate the need for mitigation. However, building demolition would reduce the amount of impervious surfaces at

DeWitt Center, thus reducing stormwater runoff rates and volumes. Elimination of building demolition would prevent this beneficial impact from occurring. Therefore, while the impacts of the Building Demolition No Project Alternative compared to the proposed project are different, the net impact is essentially the same and there is no preference between Alternative 7 and Proposed Project – Phases A, F, H, and J.

Cultural Resources

Historical Resources

Phases A, F, H, and J of the proposed project include the demolition of the following contributing features of the DeWitt General Hospital Historic District:

- Historic WWTP facilities
- Buildings 15 through 18: Medical Buildings
- Buildings 204B and 205B: Neuropsychiatric Patient Wards
- Buildings 206B, 207A&B, and 212A&B to 217A&B: Patient Wards
- Brick corridors connecting patient wards

In the Building Demolition No Project Alternative the contributing features listed above would not be demolished; therefore, Alternative 7 is preferred to Phases A, F, H, and J of the proposed project.

Archaeological Resources

Elimination of building demolition under this alternative would reduce the amount of ground disturbing activity associated with Phases A, F, H, and J. Decreased ground disturbance correspondingly reduces the likelihood of encountering buried archaeological resources during project implementation. Impacts to archaeological resources would thus be reduced under Alternative 7. Therefore, Alternative 7 is preferred to Proposed Project – Phases A, F, H, and J.

Public Facilities

No impacts to public facilities are associated with the proposed building demolition. Building demolition would remove outdated structures from DeWitt Center. These existing buildings do not comply with current building codes – for example they are seismically unsound. Elimination of building demolition would preserve these buildings and continue to expose people to safety risks. Therefore, Proposed Project – Phases A, F, H, and J are preferred to Alternative 7.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The fourteen buildings and the WWTP that would not be demolished under this alternative potentially contain asbestos and lead based paint. Under Proposed Project – Phases A, F, H, and J, these structures would be demolished after the abatement of the potentially occurring hazardous materials. If building demolition is eliminated from the proposed project, no abatement would occur and the potential for impacts to occur to site soils related to the presence of asbestos and lead-based paint would remain. Given this consideration, Phases A, F, H, and J of the proposed project are preferred to Alternative 7.

16.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVES

As shown in *Table 16.1*, all project alternatives evaluated result in greater impacts in at least one resource area. Alternatives 1 and 4, the Land Development Building No Project Alternative, and the Children's Emergency Shelter and Women's Center No Project Alternative each result in increases in only one resource area. However, these alternatives do not meet the objectives of the project. Alternative 5, the Children's Emergency Shelter and Women's Center Pasture Site alternative is the only environmentally superior alternative as it reduces or maintains the level of impact in all resource areas. In addition, the alternative location of the CES and WC facilities would provide increased security at those facilities since all visitor traffic would have to travel through DeWitt Center, and immediately in front of the proposed AJC to access the CES and WC. Future proposals for development of the CES and WC will show consideration for relocation of the facilities pursuant to Alternative 5. All other alternatives increase impacts in three or more resource areas and have been rejected in favor of the proposed project.

Table 16.1

Comparison of Impacts of Project Alternatives to Impacts of Proposed Project

Resource Area	Alternative 1 vs. Phases A and B	Alternative 2 vs. Phase C	Alternative 3 vs. Phase B	Alternative 3 vs. Phase C	Alternative 4 vs. Phase D	Alternative 5 vs. Phase D*	Alternative 6 vs. Phase D	Alternative 7 vs. Phases A, F, H and J
<i>Land Use and Housing</i>	No Change	Greater Impact	Greater Impact	Greater Impact	Greater Impact	No Change	Greater Impact	Greater Impact
<i>Aesthetics</i>	Lesser Impact	No Change	Greater Impact	Greater Impact	Lesser Impact	Lesser Impact	Lesser Impact	Greater Impact
<i>Transportation and Circulation</i>	No Change	No Change	Greater Impact	Greater Impact	Lesser Impact	Lesser Impact	Lesser Impact	No Change
<i>Air Quality</i>	Lesser Impact	Lesser Impact	No Change	No Change	Lesser Impact	No Change	Greater Impact	Lesser Impact
<i>Noise</i>	Lesser Impact	Lesser Impact	Lesser Impact	No Change	Lesser Impact	No Change	Greater Impact	Lesser Impact
<i>Biological Resources</i>	No Change	Lesser Impact	Greater Impact	Greater Impact	Lesser Impact	Lesser Impact	Lesser Impact	Lesser Impact
<i>Geology, Soils, and Seismicity</i>	No Change	Lesser Impact	Greater Impact	No Change	Lesser Impact	Lesser Impact	No Change	Lesser Impact
<i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>	No Change	Lesser Impact	Greater Impact	No Change	Lesser Impact	No Change	No Change	Lesser Impact
<i>Cultural Resources</i>	Lesser Impact	Lesser Impact	Lesser Impact	Greater Impact	No Change	No Change	Greater Impact	Lesser Impact
<i>Public Facilities</i>	No Change	No Change	No Change	No Change	No Change	No Change	No Change	Greater Impact
<i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>	Greater Impact	Lesser Impact	Greater Impact	Lesser Impact	Lesser Impact	No Change	No Change	Greater Impact

* Alternative 5 vs. Phase D has been identified as the only environmentally superior alternative.

This page left blank intentionally.